DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 081 431 JC 730 215

AUTHOR Vogel, Roberta; Schonbuch, Stan
TITLE Follow-Up Study: The Core Experiment in College Discovery.
INSTITUTION City Univ. of New York, Staten Island, N.Y. Staten Island Community Coll.
PUB DATE May 73
NOTE 43p.

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.65 HC-$3.29
DESCRIPTORS *College Freshmen; Community Colleges; *Core Curriculum; Counselor Attitudes; Experimental Curriculum; *Followup Studies; Interdisciplinary Approach; Post Secondary Education; Program Effectiveness; Questionnaires; *Student Opinion; *Teacher Attitudes; Technical Reports

ABSTRACT

The Core Experiment at Staten Island Community College is an interdisciplinary program consisting of a cluster of courses (such as freshman orientation, math, English and social science) offered to incoming students in a block. Selection of students was based on achievement test scores in English, math and physical science and on interest. Questionnaires dealing with the academic classroom situation and the orientation classroom situation were administered at the end of the fall term, 1972, to Core and non-core students, counseling faculty and teaching faculty. Items to which responses differed significantly for the two groups of students dealt with feelings of involvement in school or satisfaction with the school situation, feelings regarding the nature of the interpersonal interactions experienced while at college, and feelings regarding the structure of the classroom in terms of small-group interactions. Core students reported much more satisfaction with their college experience thus far than did non-Core students. Qualitative comparisons were also made between responses of the various groups. Core faculty and students approved of the structure of the Core as a method of facilitating effective students and learning and adding to students' satisfaction and involvement. (KM)

FILMED FROM BEST AVAILABLE COPY

ED 081431

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

FOLLOW-UP STUDY:

The Core Experiment in College Discovery

Submitted by: Roberta Vogel, PhD

Stan Schonbuch, PhD

JC 730 215

Acknowledgments

Appreciation is expressed to Dean Joseph Harris under whose direction such projects as the Core Experiment can be carried out, and to all the faculty and students involved, who have through their continued in-put, stressed the need for constant educational innovations to the system. Appreciation is also expressed to the Administration of Staten Island Community College, which has made possible continued educational advancements through the Experimental College Programs.

R.B.V.
S.S.S.
May 1973

College Discovery Program
Staten Island Community College
The City University of New York
Pres. William Birenbaum

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
Introduction	
Hypotheses	3
Method	3
Subjects	4
Procedures	4
Results	5
Discussion	10
Quantitative Findings	10
Qualitative Findings	12
Further Observations Regarding Orientation and Programming	18
Appendix A - Instructions and Questionnaires	23
Appendix B - Tables of Qualitative Comparisons	35

INTRODUCTION

In fall, 1971, the Core Experiment was begun in the College Discovery Program. The Core itself consisted of a cluster of courses offered to incoming students in a block, including such courses as freshman orientation, math, English, and social science, along with a Core Seminar. The design was of an interdisciplinary nature, based on a problem-solving approach. Some of the objectives stated by the Task Force in setting up the Core Experiment were:

1. to facilitate the breakdown of the traditional divisions between disciplines.
2. to promote greater intimacy in the classroom.
3. to help both students and teachers perceive each other in a more realistic, human way ...
4. to encourage transfer of knowledge and enthusiasm between disciplines.
5. to offer students a compact program allowing for more efficient use of time.

The Task Force had recommended that the Core Program be required for all incoming freshmen during the fall of 1971. However, only four courses were offered and registration for the Cores was encouraged though not made mandatory for all new students. The Core students were those who chose to be in the Core program.

An evaluation of the Core Experiment was conducted at the end of the first semester (see Schonbuch and Solomon - The Core Experience) and certain conclusions were reached with recommendations made for a continuation of the Core Experiment during the coming

year. It was concluded that the Core Experience may not have fully realized the goals set down by the College Discovery faculty. Some of the recommendations for follow-up were designed to revise or improve in such areas as the student selection procedure, criteria for formation of faculty teams, orientation of the faculty and students to the philosophy behind the Core Experiment before it begins, and more open discussion between faculty and students regarding their various perceptions of the impact of the Core experience.

In fall, 1972, an attempt was made to put some of these recommendations into actual practice. Four Core Programs were established for fall, 1972; the same academic courses were offered as in 1971. Similarly, the general objectives and goals of the Core were the same:

1. to facilitate the breakdown of traditional divisions between disciplines.
2. to promote greater intimacy in the classroom.
3. to help students perceive the teacher in a more realistic, human way.
4. to encourage a transfer of knowledge and enthusiasm between disciplines.
5. to raise the level of achievement in academic areas - English, math and social science.

The particular structure of the Core may be more relevant for the faculty members involved in terms of their needs, interests, and educational philosophies. Thus, another variable which was

accounted for in the design of the questionnaires used to evaluate the experience, dealt with the perceptions by faculty of whether or not such an experience was professionally rewarding for them.

HYPOTHESES

Given the general goals of the Core, the following hypotheses were generated:

As compared to non-Core students,

a. Core students will achieve more academically, as defined by grades received at the end of the term.

b. Core students will have a lower drop-out rate as defined by the number of H and J grades (failures due to absence and official drop-outs).

c. Core students will have fewer incomplete grades as defined by the number of N and M grades (incomplete course requirements).

d. Core students will report feeling more motivated to learn.

e. Core students will report feeling greater intimacy with classmates.

f. Core students will report feeling more comfortable in a group situation.

METHOD

Planning for the structure of the Cores was completed before the beginning of the fall term, 1972, at pre-registration the previous spring. However, due to the implementation for the first time in the college of a computerized registration system and the difficulties involved in getting such a system in working order, all of the Core sections except one created for fall, 1972, were destroyed by scheduling errors. This necessitated some re-evaluation

of the research goals projected for the fall, 1972 Core Experiment. It now had to be reduced to evaluating the one Core section remaining, using the criteria established, but with much fewer students and faculty participating. The risk of using such low numbers is that the existing trends may not show up as they might in the case where the number of subjects is larger. Therefore, the probability of receiving significance on any of the variables is much lower.

Subjects:

Selection of students to be included in the Core was done on the basis of performance on standardized achievement tests in English, math, and physical science. No student who needed remediation or developmental courses was included in the Core. These students also had to express some interest in the Core Experiment. Most were students enrolled in the Liberal Arts - Non-Science curriculum.

Procedures:

Instead of administering the Internal-External locus of Control Questionnaire and the Semantic Differential as done previously, a revised questionnaire based on one used in the 1971 Core study was administered at the end of fall term, 1972. There were two forms of the student questionnaire: one dealing with the academic classroom situation (Questionnaire I, see Appendix A), and one dealing with the orientation classroom situation (Questionnaire II, see Appendix A). There were corresponding

questionnaires for the counseling faculty (Questionnaire III, see Appendix A) and the teaching faculty (Questionnaire IV, Core, and Questionnaire V, Non-Core, see Appendix A) involved in the Core experiment. For comparison purposes, the Core and Non-Core students received the same forms of the student questionnaires. Similarly, the Core and Non-Core counselors and faculty received the same or comparable forms of the counselor and faculty questionnaires.

End of term grades for Core and Non-Core students were evaluated and a record kept for comparison purposes, of the number of A, B, C, D, F, H, J, N and M grades received by these students during fall term, 1972.

RESULTS

The means of the various groups were tested for the significance of the difference between the means (Fisher's t). Analyses done include:

1. Mean differences between Core and Non-Core students on Questionnaire I - Table 1.
2. Mean differences between Core and Non-Core students on Questionnaire II. - Table 2.
3. Mean differences between Core and non-Core students on the number of A, B, C, D, and F grades received as final grades for fall term, 1972. - Table 3.
4. Frequency distribution of H, J, N, and M grades for Core and Non-Core students in English, math, government and speech at the end of fall, 1972. - Table 4.
5. A comparison of the responses of Core students with Core faculty for matched items on Questionnaires I and IV (see Appendix B).
6. A comparison of the responses of Non-Core students with Non-Core faculty for matched items on Questionnaires I and V (see Appendix B).

7. A comparison of the responses of the Core faculty with the Non-Core faculty for Questionnaires IV and V (see Appendix B).

8. A comparison of the responses of the Core students with the Core counselor for matched items on Questionnaires II and III (see Appendix B).

9. A comparison of the responses of the Non-Core students with the Non-Core counselors for matched items on Questionnaires II and III (see Appendix B).

10. A comparison of the responses of the Core counselor with the Non-Core counselors for all items on Questionnaire III (see Appendix B).

TABLE I

The Significance of the Difference Between the Means of Core (N=13) and Non-Core (N=29) Students on Questionnaire I at the End of the Core Experiment, Fall, 1972.

	Non-Core		Core		T	P
Item	Mean	SD	Mean	SD		
1.	3.12	1.38	4.46	.78	-4.074	$<.00006$
2.	3.12	1.57	4.07	.86	-2.574	$<.01$
3.	3.22	1.67	3.61	1.26	- .847	NS
4.	2.93	1.71	3.30	1.70	- .657	NS
5.	3.29	1.51	4.30	.75	-2.957	$<.004$
6.	3.00	1.73	4.00	.71	-2.719	$<.007$
7.	3.32	1.47	3.76	1.24	-1.017	NS
8.	2.90	1.62	3.92	1.26	-2.248	$<.02$
9.	2.67	1.76	3.23	1.79	- .953	NS
10.	3.06	1.63	3.69	1.03	-1.538	NS
11.	1.59	1.59	3.07	1.12	.214	NS
12	3.48	1.59	3.46	1.56	.039	NS

Item	Non-Core Mean	Non-Core SD	Core Mean	Core SD	T	P
13.	3.22	1.59	3.46	1.56	- .463	NS
14.	3.00	1.37	3.23	1.42	- .495	NS
15.	2.87	1.57	2.84	1.28	.066	NS
16.	3.51	1.73	3.92	1.19	- .906	NS
17.	3.12	1.61	3.76	1.54	-1.244	NS
18.	3.48	1.52	4.15	.90	-1.809	< .07
19.	3.16	1.59	3.38	1.71	- .397	NS
20.	3.29	1.75	3.69	1.55	- .751	NS
21.	3.45	1.52	3.53	1.45	- .164	NS
22.	3.38	1.56	4.46	.78	-3.052	< .001
23.	2.70	1.49	3.84	1.21	-2.652	< .009
24.	3.03	1.58	3.92	.95	-2.293	< .002
25.	2.22	1.56	3.00	1.41	-1.617	NS

The data indicate that the mean differences for the two groups were highly significant on a total of 8 items (1, 2, 5, 6, 8, 22, 23, 24) and that the differences approached significance on 3 other items (10, 18, 25). That is, on a total of 8 items of the 25 presented, the Core group means were highly significant in the direction of support of the general objectives and goals of the Core concept.

TABLE 2

The Significance of the Difference Between the Means of Core (N=11) and Non-Core (N=20) Students on Questionnaire II at the End of the Core Experiment, Fall, 1972.

Item	Non-Core Mean	Non-Core SD	Core Mean	Core SD	T	P
1.	4.05	.91	3.75	.87	.921	NS
2.	4.47	1.02	3.91	1.38	1.213	NS
3.	4.05	1.13	3.50	1.62	1.027	NS
4.	3.84	1.07	3.83	1.40	.021	NS
5.	3.36	1.12	3.41	1.62	-.094	NS
6.	3.68	1.11	3.41	1.62	.507	NS
7.	3.21	1.51	3.33	1.37	-.228	NS
8.	3.36	1.34	3.58	1.38	-.437	NS
9.	4.15	.96	3.66	1.44	1.045	NS
10.	3.84	1.26	2.83	1.59	1.866	$> .05$
11.	3.57	1.54	3.16	1.53	.726	NS
12.	3.15	1.01	2.41	1.73	1.343	NS
13.	3.68	1.06	3.08	1.68	1.108	NS
14.	3.57	1.02	3.16	1.40	.877	NS
15.	3.89	1.49	3.58	1.78	.502	NS
16.	3.36	1.61	3.58	1.78	-.348	NS

The data indicate that there was no significant difference between the Core and Non-Core groups on the way they responded to items on Questionnaire II.

TABLE 3

Significance of the Difference Between the Means of Grade Point Averages of the Non-Core and Core Students in English, Government, Math, and Speech Classes at the end of Fall Term, 1972.

Non-Core		Core		T	P
Mean	SD	Mean	SD		
1.94	1.41	2.69	.82	4.7	$< .0006$

The data indicate that the mean difference between the grade point averages of the two groups was highly significant, in the direction of support of the hypothesis.

TABLE 4

Chi Square (X^2) Test of the Frequency of Occurrence of H, J, N, and M Grades of Non-Core and Core Students in English, Government, Math and Speech Classes at the End of Fall Term 1972.

	Non-Core	Core
H	31	24
J	15	6
N	5	12
M	4	0

$X^2 = 9.8659$

d.f. = 3

$P < .02$

The data indicate that there was a significant difference between the two groups with regard to the number of H, J, N, and M grades received in the direction of support of the hypothesis.

DISCUSSION

Quantitative Findings:

Items on Questionnaire I which differentiated significantly between the 2 groups may be placed in 3 categories:

a. feelings of involvement in school or satisfaction with the school situation (1, 2, 6).

b. feelings regarding the nature of the interpersonal interactions experienced while at college (5, 22, 23).

c. feelings regarding the structure of the classroom set-up in terms of small group interactions (8, 24).

Items which approached significance for the 2 groups involved mainly the following:

a. feelings regarding the student's ability to function in an adequate way in terms of the academic requirements (10, 18).

b. feelings regarding interpersonal interactions with the peer group (25).

The Core students reported feeling much more satisfaction with the nature of their college experience thus far. All of these students were in college for the first time, so the Core students had not yet experienced any other structure but that set up as part of the Core Experiment, while the Non-Core students had gone into the regular classroom set-up. It appears that the special structure of the Core does serve to add to students' satisfaction with the college experience and thatas a result of, or corollary to this, they feel much more involvement in what is going on around them.

An important part of this new kind of experience appears to be the kind of interpersonal interactions the Core structure made

possible for them, both in terms of peer group interactions and faculty-student interactions. The perception was that such a structure helped the student to do better in the academic area because of the facilitative nature of the group interactions. The more democratic, person-to-person level of interpersonal contacts may be seen to be a very important variable and one which is very closely related, in the students' minds, to their own ability to function in an adequate way academically. This is supported by the fact that the grade point averages of the Core students were higher than those of a randomly selected number of Non-Core students.

The basic structure consisted of small group interactions where the same faculty and students met each day. The class make-up was constant so that there was provided the opportunity for both students and faculty to get to know each other in a more personal human way. The usual roles of "student" and "faculty" could be broken down and each could relate on a more person-to-person level.

The students' reports of feeling more involvement in the academic community may also be supported by the fact that, except for some incomplete grades, the Core students received fewer failures due to non-attendance in class. They tended to remain with the class to the end of the semester instead of dropping out before. This includes both official and non-official dropouts from classes. It may be that because of the experimental nature of the Core and the involvement of the faculty in having such a structure work,

the faculty tended to give higher grades to students and to give more incomplete grades in order to prevent the occurrence of more failures. However, the students' own reports of feeling more classroom involvement, feeling able to function better, being able to see the relationship of his classwork to his outside life as well as relationships among course contents, would not support such a conclusion.

In any case, the results obtained from the quantitative analyses performed would support the continued existence of such a classroom structure within the College Discovery Program.

Qualitative Findings:

A qualitative comparison was made between the responses given by the Core students and the Core faculty on matched items of the faculty and student questionnaires (see Appendix B). The results show that faculty and students tended to agree closely with each other in their responses to two of the eight items. They did not agree on three of the eight items and there was some slight agreement on three other items. Both faculty and students felt the Core experience was a meaningful one for them but the faculty did not report feeling more involvement since their work with the Core, while students reported feeling greater involvement. Faculty reported feeling they were more able to spot students with deficiencies as a result of the Core experience. However, students did not strongly agree or disagree that the experience helped them to pinpoint their

deficiencies better. Core faculty did not seem to feel that there was any time saved in preparation due to the structure and students felt no real improvement in study habits.

Core students tended to agree that the experience was meaningful, that they felt more involved in classes and that the Core structure helped them to be able to tie together the content of the various classes. The Core faculty tended to agree that the experience was meaningful, that it helped them pinpoint student problems better, and that it seemed to help students deal with ideas better. They also tended to agree that such a structure is an effective means of establishing an interdisciplinary approach to teaching. They tended to see the students in Core as being more motivated than those in the Non-Core classes, and also as being able to improve reading and writing skills at a faster rate. They felt no time was saved in the operation and did not feel that they were any less involved in their Non-Core classes than they were while working with the Core.

The Non-Core students and Non-Core faculty responses were also compared on matched items (see Appendix B). Most of the students' responses were not in strong agreement or disagreement with the statements. Both students and faculty were more in the middle regarding the students' improved ability to analyze ideas more effectively or to relate disciplines due to the Non-Core or regular C.D. experience. The faculty tended to agree that their experience

with C.D. has been meaningful and that they feel more involvement with teaching since they have been with C.D. They also felt that they were more able to spot students with deficiencies because of the C.D. experience. The faculty strongly disagreed that their experience in C.D. has helped them to cut down at all on time used for preparation. There was also slight disagreement with items that pertained to greater rate of improvement for C.D. as opposed to Non-C.D. students in writing and reading skills and to higher motivation level in C.D. versus Non-C.D. students.

Core and Non-Core faculty were compared in their responses to items on the faculty questionnaires (see Appendix B). The Core faculty tended to agree with most items except item 2 (that they felt more involvement in teaching since the Core). They showed only average agreement with item 5 (that they felt their teaching in the Core structure to be more relevant). The Non-Core faculty gave responses which did not show either strong agreement or disagreement with the statements, except for 2 items. They tended to show strong agreement with items 1 and 5 (that the C.D. experience has been a meaningful one and a relevant one for them). They also showed strong disagreement with item 15 (that they were able to cut down on overall time for preparations within the C.D. structure).

The Core faculty tended to agree more strongly with more items than did the Non-Core faculty (15 out of 20 items). Most of the items stress the valuable nature of the structure under which the faculty member is working, in this case, the Core structure. The Core faculty

concurred with the Non-Core faculty in their disagreement that they were able to save time on over-all class preparations due to the structure of the program, whether Core or Non-Core.

Qualitative comparisons were also made of responses given by Core and Non-Core students as compared with Core and Non-Core counselors to matched items on the Student Questionnaire II and the Counselor Questionnaire (see Appendix B). As seen in the previous section, no significant difference was found between the means of the Core and Non-Core groups on the Student Questionnaire dealing with counseling. The reason for this may be that both Core and Non-Core orientation sections are structured in the same way. The only difference is that the Core orientation was included as one of the classes in the Core structure.

Most of the responses given by the Core students did not show either strong agreement or disagreement with the items, except for item 2 and item 10. Core students tended to agree that they were able to get to know their counselor better through orientation (item 2). They tended to disagree slightly that they like coming to orientation (item 10).

Core student responses on Questionnaire II were compared with matched items for counselors on Questionnaire III. The counselor responses showed a much higher degree of agreement with the statements than did the students' responses. The counselor agreed highly that

orientation helped him get to know students better, helped the student pinpoint problems and helped them to feel freer to come with problems outside of the orientation situation. The counselor showed higher degree of agreement on 11 of the 12 items presented than did the students, indicating that their perceptions of the value of the orientation was not as favorable as the counselor's perception.

Non-Core students responses were also compared with Non-Core counselor responses for matched items on Questionnaires II and III. The Non-Core counselors tended to be in the middle of the distribution between agreement and disagreement on most items (7 out of 12). They tended to agree more strongly on 4 out of the 12 items: that the students liked orientation (item 1), that it helped them get to know students better (item 2), that it facilitated interpersonal relations between counselor and students (item 15), and that it helped the counselees feel freer to see the counselor regarding their problems outside of the orientation class (item 16). The students also tended to be in the middle range on most items but more strongly agreed, as did the counselors, on items 1, 2 and 15. They also agreed somewhat more strongly with items 9 and 10, that orientation helped them begin to examine career goals and that they liked coming to orientation. Item 10 is simply a rephrasing of item 1, on which counselors and students agree.

The Non-Core counselors and students tended to have closer agreement on most of the matched items (8 out of 12), except on items 13 and 16. The counselors disagreed more strongly that

orientation counseling was more meaningful than the one-to-one situation. Students did not feel as strongly as counselors that the orientation helped them to feel freer to come to see the counselors about other problems outside of the class.

The Core counselor's responses were compared with those of the Non-Core counselors for all items on Questionnaire III. The Core counselor tended to give higher agreement responses than did the Non-Core counselors. He agreed very highly with statements which stressed such advantages of orientation as getting to know students better, establishing greater rapport, maintaining better contact, pinpointing problem areas more quickly, and students feeling freer to come to see the counselor outside the class situation.

The Non-Core counselors tended to respond in the middle range of agreement on most items but did show more agreement with items which stressed such advantages of orientation as feeling the students liked orientation, getting to know students better, establishing greater rapport, maintaining better contact with students, facilitation of the interpersonal relationship between counselor and student, and feeling that students felt freer to come to the counselor outside the classroom situation.

There was closer agreement between the Core and Non-Core counselors on 13 of the 16 items. There was disagreement on 3 of the items, with the Core counselor tending to agree more highly with the statements than did the Non-Core counselors. These items dealt with such things

as being able to pinpoint problems quicker thru orientation, feeling that the interpersonal contacts of orientation had a greater impact than did individual counseling, and feeling that the orientation itself was more meaningful to students than the usual one-to-one situation.

Further Observations Regarding Orientation and Programming:

Responses from open-ended questions regarding counseling (items #17, 18, 19 on Questionnaire II) were answered only by those students in the Non-Core group. The nature of the responses given have some implications for further program planning. Item 17 asked what was most liked about the orientation section. The responses tended to fall within 4 major categories. These were 1) receiving help with problems. 2) getting information which the student felt was relevant to his academic and campus life. 3) the advantages of closer contact with a counselor whom they saw as being concerned. 4) the informality of structure and the group atmosphere of the sessions.

The students seemed to feel that they were able to get prompter help with problems because of the existence of an orientation section devoted largely to students' concerns. They felt they could bring in any problem they might have, including concerns about other faculty and receive concerned help, where otherwise this might not have occurred.This included help with courses and academics.

Another advantage of orientation mentioned by these students was the information-giving aspect, whereby they were able to learn more about the campus, the facilities available to them on campus, information about courses and curriculum and general survival techniques for functioning adequately at the college.

The students also felt that orientation made a difference in terms of the relationship with the counselor. The counselor was seen as an understanding, concerned person who cared what happened to them. They also liked the opportunity that orientation afforded them to get to know the counselor better and to have closer contact with the counselor.

The group setting in which orientation was conducted was a fourth characteristic to which the students responded favorably. No negative reactions to the group setting were elicited. On the contrary, students reacted favorably toward the informal atmosphere of the group, the opportunity for interaction among students, and the openness and sharing of experiences which they felt toward each other within the group.

Miscellaneous points included such things as the fact that guest speakers were brought in, interesting topics were covered, and some life planning was done probably related to career choices.

Much of what was mentioned as disadvantages or negative points relating to orientation were not concerned with the orientation per se, but with such external things as the time it was held (too early or too late); the day on which it was held (Friday); not enough

credit was given for it; the room in which it was held was uncomfortable. A few students mentioned such things as the fact that it was held for two periods (too long), that they didn't meet new people. Only two students criticized the content itself, one mentioning the fact that at times personal topics were dealt with and another, that he was discouraged from loading up with credits at the beginning of his stay at the college. Most of the students mentioned no disadvantages and a few stated clearly that they experienced no disadvantages at all in the orientation set-up.

Students also mentioned some changes in the structure of the orientation section which they felt they would like to see implemented. Some of them may be seen as indications of positive reactions to orientation. A few were negative reactions and a few were criticisms dealing with more programmatic issues. The positive type of reactions were indicated by such changes as a desire for more of the same kind of interaction among students as occurred in the orientation class. Students mentioned wanting the class to meet more often than simply once a week and some even suggested the possibility of having the group continue for at least the whole year and possibly for the entire stay at S.I.C.C. Others mentioned the wish to have even more guest or outside speakers come in to talk with them on specific issues.

Some of the negative reactions dealt with changes in the length of the class - it should be even shorter than two periods. Some felt the class itself should be optional and not a required course for students. Some desired to see fewer students in the

class. Criticisms or changes more reflective of programmatic issues were such things as the fact that the course should carry more than 1 credit and that there should be more requirements attached to the Liberal Arts Curriculum offered. One major programmatic criticism dealt with perceived philosophical orientation of the program. Some students stated that there should be more distinction made between the economically handicapped and the educationally handicapped student. What may be implied here is that the program seems to address itself more to the needs of the educationally handicapped to the neglect of those advanced students who are in the program for purely economic reasons. This would be a strong argument and support for more differentiation among levels of difficulty of the courses offered, suggesting that courses that would be stimulating and challenging to the advanced student be given as much attention as those courses which are of a developmental nature.

Two Non-Core and 1 Core counselor took part in the study, giving qualitative reactions to the orientation class as presently structured. The Core counselor mentioned as advantages of the orientation class, the interpersonal contact with students and the facilitation of both academic and individual counseling. Non-Core counselors also mentioned as advantages the opportunity for students to have shared experiences and interpersonal contact in a group setting. They further added as advantages the opportunity for the counselor and the students to have more contact with each other and

the facilitation of the counselor-student interaction as a result of the orientation class structure.

The only disadvantages or changes mentioned dealt mainly with the structure of the class set-up. Both Core and Non-Core counselors felt that the class might better be either shortened to eight weeks instead of fourteen or divided into two sections of 7 - 8 weeks each, with one 7-week period dealing with information-giving and the other 7-week period being mainly group interaction and problem-solving. There was agreement, however, that the orientation class is a very valuable part of the program set-up, and that it should be continued as such.

CONCLUSIONS

The special structure of the Core does serve to add to students' satisfaction and involvement with their College experience. The facilitative nature of the group structure and its encouragement of positive peer-group and faculty-student interactions, was closely related to both students' perceptions of their ability to function adequately in the classroom and to their actual academic achievements in the course material. The Core structure seemed to be a useful way of establishing an interdisciplinary approach to teaching and of breaking down traditional divisions among disciplines. Both faculty and students involved in the Core tend to feel that the structure of the Core is a valuable educational tool and one conducive to effective teaching and learning.

Appendix A

Instructions and Questionnaires

Instructions to the Professor

Give each student one copy of the questionnaire and one answer sheet. Read aloud the instructions at the top of the questionnaire to be sure that the students understand what they are to do. Check to see whether there are any questions. If not, then they may proceed with the questionnaire.

Be sure that all of them are completed and turned in to you by the end of the class session. You should get one questionnaire and one answer sheet from each student. Please be sure these are all returned to Stan Schonbuch or to Bobbi Vogel, in the brown envelope, by Thursday, December 14, 1972.

Thank you for your cooperation

Please Note:

Make a correction in the instructions to the students at the beginning of each questionnaire.

The second paragraph should read

"Read the questions carefully before answering. Then, on the answer sheet, darken the space beneath the letters, from A to E, which best indicates the strength or weakness of your agreement with the question.

A = strongly disagree
E = strongly agree

Letters are substituted for numbers on the answer sheet.

We in College Discovery are interested in what our students and faculty feel about their experiences within the program. We need such reactions because this feedback is essential if we are to provide a useful and relevant program for our students. At this time we would like your response to various aspects of the program. Your responses are completely confidential and you need not sign your name. The essential point is that you respond as truthfully as you can.

Read the questions carefully before answering. Then, on the answer sheet, darken the space beneath the number, from 1 to 5, which best indicates the strength or weakness of your agreement with the question. 1 = strongly disagree 5 = strongly agree

STUDENT QUESTIONNAIRE I

1. Generally speaking, my experience at SICC has been a meaningful one.

2. I feel more involvement in my classes since I've been at SICC.

3. I feel my courses are very relevant to my learning.

4. Whenever I had difficulty in a particular subject, I found that I was able to get more help in improving my performance than I did before I entered SICC.

5. The contact I have with my fellow students and the faculty has helped me to do better in my studies here.

6. Since I've been at SICC, I've been better able to relate my course work to relevant parts of my life outside of college - college has more meaning for me than before.

7. I find that the course material is taught in such a way that I can easily understand what's being presented.

8. My experience in my courses has made it easier for me to speak out in a group.

9. I have participated more in class discussions here than in high school.

10. Since I've been at SICC, I have been able to keep up with my course work.

11. My courses have helped me to pinpoint areas in which I am having difficulty, such as poor study skills, etc.

12. I feel that there is much more material that I have to learn here at SICC than I had previously.

13. Since I've been at SICC, I feel I've been able to improve my over-all performance in my classes.

14. I feel that my courses have made learning more desirable and exciting for me.

15. Since I've been at SICC, I find that I am able to keep up with my course work through the use of better study habits.

16. Sometimes I feel that material I learn in one class helps me to better understand material presented in other classes.

17. The structure and atmosphere of my classes help me to meet other students.

18. Since I've been at SICC, I have improved in my ability to tie together things I've learned in one class with facts in other classes.

19. Since I've been at SICC, I have been able to make considerable improvement in my reading, writing and speaking skills.

20. Since I've been at SICC, I've found that I feel much more interest in my course work and more motivation to do well in my studies.

21. My courses have made me feel more positively about attending class.

22. The atmosphere and structure of my courses have helped me and my fellow students, as well as the teachers, relate to each other on a more democratic, person-to-person level.

23. I now have a sense that people respect and personally consider, though not necessarily agree with, what I have to say.

24. I feel that the experiences in my courses have given me more confidence in a group situation.

25. My confidence in relating to the opposite sex has been increased by my experiences in my courses.

We in College Discovery are interested in what our students and faculty feel about their experiences within the program. We need such reactions because this feedback is essential if we are to provide a useful and relevant program for our students. At this time we would like your response to various aspects of the program. Your responses are completely confidential and you need not sign your name. The essential point is that you respond as truthfully as you can.

Read the questions carefully before answering. Then, on the answer sheet, darken the space beneath the number, from 1 to 5, which best indicates the strength or weakness of your agreement with the question. 1 = strongly disagree 5 = strongly agree

STUDENT QUESTIONNAIRE II

1. Generally speaking, I did like the orientation section and felt it was very helpful to me

strongly disagree 1 2 3 4 5 strongly agree

2. I feel that the orientation section was effective in helping me to get to know my counselor better.

3. I feel that orientation helped me by providing the necessary information I needed in getting along on campus.

4. I feel orientation was helpful in making me feel that I belonged on campus and was not simply a new person in a strange place.

5. I feel orientation was helpful in my being able to get along better with my fellow students.

6. I feel that the orientation class really helped me to become more comfortable in speaking out in a group situation.

7. Discussions in orientation helped me to learn more about myself and some special problems I might have.

8. I feel that orientation encouraged interaction and interpersonal communication which was helpful to me as a person.

9. I felt that discussions during orientation helped me to begin looking more closely at what I really want to do with my life in terms of career planning.

10. I liked coming to orientation and felt it was time well-spent.

11. If I had a choice I would always include an orientation section in my program.

12. Through orientation, I have been able to meet many new friends.

13. As compared with the regular individual counseling sessions, I feel that I got somewhat more from the oreintation group experience.

14. The orientation class helped to motivate me and spark my interest in my course work here at SICC.

15. The orientation class seemed to have made it easier for me to relate with my counselor during the individual session I had.

16. The orientation class made it easier for me to go to my counselor with other problems I had.

17. What I liked most about orientation was (put your responses on this sheet)

    1.

    2.

    3.

18. What I disliked most about orientation was (put your responses on this sheet)

    1.

    2.

    3.

19. Some Changes I would like to see made in the orientation classes are (put your responses on this sheet)

    1.

    2.

    3.

We in College Discovery are interested in what our students and faculty feel about their experiences within the program. We need such reactions because this feedback is essential if we are to provide a useful and relevant program for our students. At this time we would like your response to various aspects of the program. Your responses are completely confidential and you need not sign your name. The essential point is that you respond as truthfully as you can.

Read the question carefully before answering. Then, on the answer sheet, darken the space beneath the number, from 1 to 5, which best indicates the strength or weakness of your agreement with the question. 1 = strongly disagree 5 = strongly agree

COUNSELOR QUESTIONNAIRE

1. Generally speaking, I felt that the students liked orientation and felt it was very helpful to them.

2. I felt that the orientation section was effective in helping me get to know my counselees better.

3. I felt orientation helped me to establish some rapport with my students much quicker than if I had not seen them in an orientation section.

4. I felt that orientation helped me to maintain better contact with my counselees than I would have had otherwise.

5. Students in the orientation class seemed to become gradually more comfortable with each other interpersonally.

6. Students in the orientation class seemed to become gradually more comfortable in the group situation.

7. The orientation class seems to be helpful in getting students to pinpoint problem areas more quickly.

8. I felt satisfied with the kinds of inter-actions and levels of interaction which occurred in the orientation class.

9. I felt that discussions during orientation were helpful in getting the students to begin examining their career plans more closely.

10. Students in orientation seemed to enjoy coming and to get a lot out of the class.

11. I feel that some changes should be made in the orientation class structure.

12. As compared with the regular counselling experience, the impact on the student interpersonally has been greater.

13. As compared with the regular counseling experience, on a one-to-one basis, the orientation counseling experience has been more meaningful.

14. The orientation class seems to have had a strong effect on the students attitudes and motivation regarding academics.

15. The orientation class seems to have facilitated the interpersonal relationships between me and my individual counselees.

16. The orientation class seems to have helped my counselees to feel freer to come to me with problems outside of the class situation.

17. I feel the orientation section has some distinct advantages these are: (put your responses on this sheet)

    1.

    2.

    3.

18. I feel the orientation section has some distinct disadvantages these are: (put your responses on this sheet)

    1.

    2.

    3.

19. Some changes I would like to see made in the structure of the orientation classes are: (put your responses on this sheet)

    1.

    2.

    3.

We in College Discovery are interested in what our students and faculty feel about their experiences within the program. We need such reactions because this feedback is essential if we are to provide a useful and relevant program for out students. At this time we would like your response to various aspects of the program. Your responses are completely confidential and you need not sign your name. The essential point is that you respond as truthfully as you can.

Read the questions carefully before answering. Then, on the answer sheet, darken the space beneath the number, from 1 to 5, which best indicates the strength or weakness of your agreement with the question. 1 = strongly disagree 5 = strongly agree

CORE FACULTY QUESTIONAIRE

1. Generally speaking, my experience with the Core has been a meaningful one.

2. I feel more involvement in my teaching since I have been involved with the Core.

3. The Core structure has fostered increased communications among faculty members in areas dealing with academics and the various disciplines.

4. The Core structure has been helpful to the exchange of ideas and suggestions for teaching techniques as well as content.

5. The Core structure has helped me to realize some of my own personal goals and needs re: teaching, in that I feel my teaching within this structure has been more relevant for me.

6. The Core teaching experience has fostered the working out of differneces among disciplines.

7. The Core experience has been effective in fostering more of an inter-disciplinary approach to education.

8. The idea of the Core experience in congruent with my own ideas regarding teaching and education.

9. The Core experience has helped me to deal more effectively with interpersonal and personality differences I've had with other faculty.

10. The meetings derived from the Core experience have been very helpful in my work with students.

11. My experiences with the Core have been useful in helping me spot students with specific deficiences.

12. Meetings derived from the Core experience have helped me to interrelate material from my own discipline with that of the other disciplines in the program.

13. I find that I am able to work more effectively with my colleagues as a direct result of some of the experiences I have had in the Core.

14. As a result of the Core structure, I have been able to coordinate my classwork more effectively and easily.

15. On the whole, the Core structure has helped me to cut down on the over-all time I have had to spend in preparations for my classes.

16. I feel that students in the Core have been able to analyze and deal with ideas more effectively as a result of their experience with the Core.

17. I feel that personality issues among the faculty have diminished as a result of the Core experience.

18. As a result of the Core experience, I now feel that I can effectively show my students the relationships among problems in different disciplines.

19. I have seen a real difference in the improvement rate of students in the Core in the areas of reading, writing, and speaking, as compared with my non-Core students.

20. On the whole, the students in the Core seem to feel more motivated and enthusiastic about their educational experience, as compared with non-Core students.

We in College Discovery are interested in what our students and faculty feel about their experiences within the program. We need such reactions because this feedback is essential if we are to provide a useful and relevant program for our students. At this time we would like your response to various aspects of the program. Your responses are completely confidential and you need not sign your name. The essential point is that you respond as truthfully as you can.

Read the questions carefully before answering. Then, on the answer sheet, darken the space beneath the number, from A to E which best indicates the strength or weakness of your agreement with the question. A = strongly disagree E = strongly agree

FACULTY QUESTIONNAIRE

1. Generally speaking, my experience with College Discovery has been a meaningful one.

2. I feel more involvement in my teaching since I have been involved with CD.

3. The CD structure has fostered increased communications among faculty members in areas dealing with academics and the various disciplines.

4. The CD structure has been helpful to the exchange of ideas and suggestions for teaching techniques as well as content.

5. The CD structure has helped me to realize some of my own personal goals and needs re: teaching, in that I feel my teaching within this structure has been more relevant for me.

6. The CD teaching experience has fostered the working out of differences among disciplines.

7. The CD experience has been effective in fostering more of an inter-disciplinary approach to education.

8. The idea of the CD experience is congruent with my own ideas regarding teaching and education.

9. The CD experience has helped me to deal more effectively with interpersonal and personality differences I've had with other faculty.

10. The meetings derived from the CD experience have been very helpful in my work with students.

11. My experiences with CD have been useful in helping me spot students with specific deficiences.

12. Meetings derived from the CD experience have helped me to interrelate material from my own discipline with that of the other disciplines in the program.

13. I find that I am able to work more effectively with my colleagues as a direct result of some of the experiences I have had in CD.

14. As a result of the CD structure, I have been able to coordinate my classwork more effectively and easily.

15. On the whole, the CD structure has helped me to cut down on the over-all time I have had to spend in preparations for my classes.

16. I feel that students in CD have been able to analyze and deal with ideas more effectively as a result of their experience.

17. I feel that personality issues among the faculty have diminished as a result of experiences in CD.

18. As a result of the CD experience, I now feel that I can effectively show my students the relationships among problems in different disciplines.

19. I have seen a real difference in the improvement rate of students in CD in the areas of reading, writing, and speaking, as compared with my Non-CD students.

20. On the whole, the students in CD seem to feel more motivated and enthusiastic about their educational experience, as compared with Non-CD students.

Appendix B

Tables of Qualitative Comparisons

TABLE 5

Comparison of the Responses of the Core Students (N=13 on Questionnaire I with Comparable Responses of the Core Faculty (N=3) on Questionnaire IV, at the end of fall term, 1972.

Item	Core Students Responses (N-13)		Core Faculty Responses (N=3)
	Mean	S.D.	Mean
1.	4.46	.78	4.33
2.	4.07	.86	2.67
11.	3.07	1.12	4.0
15.	2.84	1.28	1.67
16.	3.92	1.19	4.67
18.	4.15	.90	4.33
19.	3.38	1.71	4.0
20.	3.69	1.55	4.33

TABLE 6

Comparison of the Responses of the Non-Core students (N=29) on Questionnaire I with Comparable Responses of the Non-Core Faculty (N=2) on Questionnaire IV, at the end of fall term, 1972.

Item	Non-Core Students (N=29)		Non-Core Faculty (N=2)
	Mean	S.D.	Mean
1.	3.12	1.38	5.0
2.	3.12	1.57	4.0
11.	3.16	1.59	4.5
15.	2.87	1.57	1.0
16.	3.51	1.73	3.5
18.	3.48	1.52	3.5
19.	3.16	1.59	2.0
20.	3.29	1.75	2.5

TABLE 7

Comparison of the Responses of the Core Faculty (N=3) with the Non-Core Faculty (N=2) on Questionnaire IV, at the end of fall term, 1972.

Item	Core Faculty M (N-3)	Non-Core Faculty M (N=2)
1.	4.33	5.0
2.	2.67	4.0
3.	4.0	3.5
4.	4.0	3.0
5.	3.67	5.0
6.	4.33	3.0
7.	4.33	3.5
8.	4.33	3.5
9.	4.0 (N=2)	4.0
10.	4.33	3.5
11.	4.0	4.5
12.	4.33	4.0
13.	4.0	3.5
14.	4.0	3.5
15.	1.67	1.0
16.	4.67	3.5
17.	4.33	2.0
18.	4.33	3.5
19.	4.0	2.0
20.	4.33	2.5

TABLE 8

Comparison of the Responses of the Core Students (N=11) on Questionnaire II with Comparable Responses of the Core Counselor (N=1) on Questionnaire III, at the end of fall term, 1972.

Item	Core Students (N=11) Mean	S.D.	Core Counselor (N=1) Mean
1.	3.75	.87	4.0
2.	3.91	1.38	5.0
5.	3.41	1.62	4.0
6.	3.41	1.62	4.0
7.	3.33	1.37	5.0
8.	3.58	1.38	3.0
9.	3.66	1.44	3.0
10.	2.83	1.59	4.0
13.	3.08	1.68	4.0
14	3.16	1.40	3.0
15.	3.58	1.78	4.0
16.	3.58	1.78	5.0

TABLE 9

Comparison of the Responses of the Non-Core Students (N=20) on Questionnaire II with Comparable Responses of the Non-Core Counselors (N=2) on Questionnaire III, at the end of fall term, 1972.

	Non-Core Students (N=20)		Non-Core Counselors (N=2)
Item	Mean	S.D.	Mean
1.	4.05	.91	4.0
2.	4.47	1.02	4.5
5.	3.36	1.12	3.5
6.	3.68	1.11	3.5
7.	3.21	1.51	3.5
8.	3.36	1.34	3.0
9.	4.15	.96	3.5
10.	3.84	1.26	3.5
13.	3.68	1.06	2.5
14.	3.57	1.02	3.5
15.	3.89	1.49	4.0
16.	3.36	1.61	5.0

TABLE 10

Comparison of the Responses of the Core Counselor (N=1) with Responses of Non-Core Counselors (N=2) for all items on Questionnaire III, at the end of fall term, 1972.

Item	Core (N=1)	Non-Core (N=2)
1.	4.0	4.0
2,	5.0	4.5
3.	5.0	4.5
4.	5.0	5.0
5.	4.0	3.5
6.	4.0	3.5
7.	5.0	3.5
8.	3.0	3.0
9.	3.0	3.5
10.	4.0	3.5
11.	4.0	3.5
12.	4.0	3.0
13.	4.0	2.5
14.	3.0	3.5
15.	4.0	4.0
16.	5.0	5.0

UNIVERSITY OF CALIF.
LOS ANGELES

OCT 19 1973

CLEARINGHOUSE FOR
JUNIOR COLLEGE
INFORMATION